arXiv:quant-ph/0010036v1 9 Oct 2000

Coherent quantum measurement for the direct determination of the degree of polarization and Polarization Mode Dispersion compensation

N. Gisin
Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland
(February 1, 2008)

An example of a coherent measurement for the direct evaluation of the degree of polarization of a single-mode optical beam is presented. It is applied to the case of great practical importance where depolarization is caused by polarization mode dispersion. It is demonstrated that coherent measurement has the potential of significantly increasing the information gain, compared to standard incoherent measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the lessons of quantum information theory [1,2] is that coherent measurements generally provide more information than incoherent ones. And this is true even if the quantum systems under investigation are not entangled. Recall that coherent measurements are represented by operators whose eigenvectors are entangled. Consequently, coherent measurements, contrary to incoherent ones, necessarily treat several systems at once. Most known examples use spin $\frac{1}{2}$, named in this context *qubits*. For instance, to determine the direction $\vec{m}$ of 2 spin $\frac{1}{2}$ in a pure but unknown state $|\vec{m}\rangle\otimes|\vec{m}\rangle$, Massar and Popescu [3] have proven that a specific coherent measurement provides the maximal possible fidelity [4], strictly better than all successive standard measurement, even if the second one is allowed to depend on the result of the first one. This is an intellectually attractive result! The game is possibly even more fascinating if one starts from 2 spin $\frac{1}{2}$ in pure, but opposite states $|\vec{m}\rangle\otimes|-\vec{m}\rangle$ [5]. But, admittedly, all known examples, in particular the above mentioned ones, are somewhat artificial. Also, in order to have a well defined and tractable problem, all examples assume simple a priori distributions (e.g. random directions, but pure state) and use as figure of merit the concept of fidelity [4], whose main quality is to be easy to compute.

In this letter, on the contrary, we consider a problem of great practical value and show that coherent measurements could provide a real advantage over all possible incoherent measurements schemes. Moreover, our proposal can be realized with today's technology and has the potential of being made very compact and cost effective. The price to pay, conceptually, is that the figure of merit and the a priori distribution are not uniquely defined. The concept of *optimal* measurement is thus ill-defined.

The problem is to measure the Degree Of Polarization (DOP) of a single mode optical beam, e.g. at the output of a single-mode optical fiber. This is usually done indirectly, by measuring all 4 Stokes parameters. This is typically an incoherent measurement scheme: each photon is measured with a polarizing beam splitter (PBS) with detectors at each of the outports. For about a third of the photons the PBS analyses circular polarization, while for the second and last third of photons it analyses the photons in the horizontal-vertical and diagonal linear polarization bases, respectively. Such polarimeters are expensive, bulky, rather slow and require frequent recalibration. But one can easily convince oneself that there is no better way to measure the DOP if one treats each photon separately, i.e. if one uses incoherent measurements. Let us note that treating photons separately does not mean that one uses single-photon detector (actually, all commercial polarimeters use analog detectors sensitive to the photon flux); it means that the contribution of each photon is independent of all the others.

Now, assume we have 2 photons in the same unknown mixed state (we denote polarization states by vectors, using the Poincaré sphere representation):

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}+\vec{M}\vec{\sigma}}{2}\otimes\frac{\mathbb{1}+\vec{M}\vec{\sigma}}{2} \tag{1}$$

where the DOP equals $|\vec{M}|$, $0\leq|\vec{M}|\leq 1$, and $\vec{\sigma}$ denote the Pauli matrices. The state (1) is clearly not entangled, but let us consider coherent measurements on such states. The overlap between the product state (1) and the archetype of entangled state, the singlet $\psi^{(-)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle-|\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle\right)$, reads:

$$\langle\psi^{(-)}|\frac{\mathbb{1}+\vec{M}\vec{\sigma}}{2}\otimes\frac{\mathbb{1}+\vec{M}\vec{\sigma}}{2}|\psi^{(-)}\rangle=\frac{1-|\vec{M}|^2}{4} \tag{2}$$

Consequently, a coherent measurement with the singlet state as eigenstate provides results directly related to the DOP. Intuitively this can be understood as follows. If the DOP is high, the photons are likely to have the same polarization and thus no overlap with the singlet state (recall that in a singlet state the 2 spin $\frac{1}{2}$ are anti-correlated in all direction).

It is natural to ask whether the above coherent measurement is better in principle than a succession of two incoherent measurements. But, a priori the question seems ill defined because there is no natural a priori probability distribution for the DOP (for the direction of $\vec{M}$ we make the natural assumption of complete randomness, i.e. the direction is uniformly distributed). One possible distribution for the DOP could be uniform between 0 and 1. Another would assume that the vector $\vec{M}$ is uniformly distributed in the sphere equipped with the euclidean metric. But in fact the a priori distribution depends on the problem under consideration. In the next section we present the problem we have in mind and compute the corresponding probability distribution for the DOP.

II. DEPOLARIZATION DUE TO POLARIZATION MODE DISPERSION

Polarization Mode Dispersion (PMD) is presently one of the limiting factor in optical fiber communication systems (see [6] and reference therein). In particular, fibers installed in the 1980's have rather large PMDs and there is an intense effort to develop PMD compensators [7]. One difficulty is that PMD is a statistical quantity (see below), the compensator must thus be active. Ideally, the feedback parameter should be the Differential Group Delay (DGD), but the measurement time would be too long. Another possible feedback parameter is the DOP. There is thus a high interest in fast DOP measurement techniques. In addition to speed, typically in the microsecond domain, the measurement should operate at low powers (μW). In this section we briefly recall the origin of PMD, the basic concepts of Principal States (PS) and of Differential Group Delay (DGD) [8] and compute the induced depolarization. This provides the a priori DOP distribution for this case of great practical importance.

PMD is cause by small asymmetries in the fiber, hence locally there are two group velocities. This simple picture has to be combined with polarization mode coupling: the degeneracy between the 2 polarization modes of perfectly circular fibers is only slightly lifted by the asymmetry present in all real fibers. Consequently, the 2 polarization modes couple easily. Accordingly, the photons propagate partly in the fast mode, partly in the slow mode. The polarization mode coupling is very sensitive to any mechanical or thermal perturbation. Thus, in practice, it fluctuates and has to be considered as a statistical phenomenon. If the source is of very low coherence, the outcoming light is completely depolarized. If, at the other extreme, the source is monochromatic with optical frequency ω, the beam propagating in the single-mode fibre is fully polarized, its polarization state ψ_ω resulting from complex interferences. In the realistic cases the optical spectrum $\Delta\omega$ is finite but small compared to the PMD. One can then show that there exists two mutually orthogonal privilege polarization modes, called the Principal States (PS) ψ_ω^{PS}, characterized by their stability to first order [8]:

$$\frac{\partial \psi_\omega^{PS}}{\partial \omega} = \pm \frac{i}{2} \delta\tau(\omega) \psi_\omega^{PS} \tag{3}$$

where $\delta\tau(\omega)$ is the DGD, i.e. the relative delay between the two PS. Note that (3) implies $\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega}\langle\vec{\sigma}\rangle_{\psi_\omega^{PS}} = 0$. Any incoming polarization state can thus be decomposed onto the two PS which then propagate without distortion (neglecting chromatic dispersion), but at slightly different velocities, as illustrated on Figure 1. Assuming incoming pulses of Gaussian shape, $I(t) = I_0 e^{-t^2/2\sigma^2}$ with spread σ, the outcoming pulses in each PS read:

$$E_{fast}(t) = E_0 \sqrt{\frac{1+\eta}{2}} e^{(t-\tau_0-\delta\tau)^2/4\sigma^2} \tag{4}$$

$$E_{slow}(t) = E_0 \sqrt{\frac{1-\eta}{2}} e^{(t-\tau_0+\delta\tau)^2/4\sigma^2} \tag{5}$$

where τ_0 is the mean propagation time, E_0 takes into account the attenuation and η denotes the relative intensity of each PS (η is randomly distributed between -1 and 1). It is known that for fibers much longer than the mean polarization mode coupling length (in practice fibers longer than a few km), the DGD $\delta\tau$ is a random variable with Maxwell distribution [9–11]:

$$\rho(\delta\tau) = \frac{3\delta\tau^2}{\sqrt{\pi/6}\ (\Delta\tau)^3} exp(-\frac{3\delta\tau^2}{2(\Delta\tau)^2}) \tag{6}$$

where the rms DGD $\Delta\tau$ is defined as the PMD.

The polarization state of the outcoming light can now by described by the following density matrix:

$$\begin{align} \rho = \int dt(E_{fast}|fast\rangle + E_{slow}|slow\rangle) \tag{7} \\ (E_{fast}\langle fast| + E_{slow}\langle slow|) \tag{8} \\ = \frac{\mathbb{1} + \vec{M}\vec{\sigma}}{2} \tag{9} \end{align}$$

from which the DOP can be computed:

$$DOP = M \equiv |\vec{M}| = \Big(\eta^2 + (1-\eta^2)e^{-\delta\tau^2/4\sigma^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{10}$$

The DOP probability distribution can be computed from:

$$\rho(M) = -\frac{d}{dM}\ Prob(DOP \geq M) \tag{11}$$

where $Prob(DOP \geq M) = \int_0^\infty d(\delta\tau)\rho(\delta\tau)\int_{\eta_{\min}}^1 d\eta$ and $\eta_{\min}^2 = \max\{0, \frac{M^2 - e^{-\delta\tau^2/4\sigma^2}}{1-e^{-\delta\tau^2/4\sigma^2}}\}$. Figure 2 illustrates the corresponding DOP probability distribution for pulses with spread σ=10 ps and PMDs $\Delta\tau$=20, 30 and 40 ps.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COHERENT MEASUREMENT

Implementation of coherent measurements require 2-photon processes, i.e. non-linear optics. Efficient 2-photon absorption at telecom wavelength has been demonstrated using commercial devices [12,13]. In these demonstrations, however, the two photons had to have a fixed polarization, determined by the geometry of the device. In order to have a selective 2-photon absorption for the singlet state, interference effects have to be exploited. This is clearly possible using either gas cells as suggested in [14] for Bell-state analysis, or using solid state devices [15]. More generally, any of the configurations used to produce maximally entangled polarization states via parametric downconversion in nonlinear crystals could be used (see e.g. [16,17]), permuting the input and output, see figure 3. For the 1550 nm telecom wavelength, the upconverted photons around 775 nm can be detected with efficient Si avalanche photodiodes. Such simple configurations could be improved using cavities similar to the techniques used in optical parametric oscillators.

Note that since photons are bosons, two photons can be in the anti-symmetric singlet polarization state only if either they propagate in different modes [18], or they have different wavelengths. When photon pairs are prepared in the singlet state for quantum information experiments, they are usually send in different directions. But in the present case they arrive within the same optical pulse in the same single-mode optical fiber. Hence they can have a singlet component only if the optical spectrum is not arbitrarily sharp, in agreement with the fact that a single spatial mode of perfectly monochromatic light is always 100% polarized. Accordingly, a possibly convenient collinear configuration to measure the singlet component, hence to measure the DOP, consists in 2 type II crystals in series (type II means that the two photons have mutually orthogonal polarizations). The first crystal's cut should be such that phase matching favors 2-photon absorption with the lower frequency photon polarized vertically, while the second crystal is such that 2-photon absorption is favorable when the lower frequency photon is polarized horizontally. The 2-photon absorptions in the 2 crystals are coherent in the sense that the upconverted photon results from the coherent superposition of the processes taking place in each crystal. The distance between the crystals can thus be adjusted such that only photon pairs in the singlet state are upconverted.

IV. FIGURES OF MERIT

It is too early to assess the practical value of our proposal, though we plan to work on this issue. With enough engineering efforts, one can expect a compact device. This would be the first direct measurement of the DOP, usually measured indirectly via the 4 Stokes parameters. Accordingly, an improved accuracy to measurement-time ratio might be achieved.

On the conceptual side, let's assume that one has 2 photons in state (1) where the direction of $\vec{M}$ is random and the DOP $|\vec{M}|$ a priori distribution follows (11). If the coherent measurement produces the outcome "singlet", then the a posteriori distribution reads:

$$\rho(M|singlet) = \rho(M)\frac{P(singlet|M)}{P_{singlet}} \qquad (12)$$

where $P_{singlet} = \int_0^1 \rho(S)P(singlet|S)dS$ and $P(singlet|M)$ is given by (2). In this case the information gain is given by $I_{singlet} \equiv H_0 - H_{singlet}$ with the entropies $H_0 = \int_o^1 dM\rho(M)\log_2(\rho(M))$ and $H_{singlet} = \int_o^1 dM\rho(M|singlet)\log_2(\rho(M|singlet))$. The case of "triplet" outcome is similar. The mean information gain for coherent measurement is thus: $I_{coh.} = P_{singlet}I_{singlet} + P_{triplet}I_{triplet}$. This should be compared to the information gain using incoherent measurements. The optimal is obtained when measuring both photons in the same basis. The probability $P(o_1 = o_2|M)$ that both photons produce the same result o_j is then $P(o_1 = o_2|M) = \frac{3+M^2}{6}$. We found numerically that the information gain using the coherent measurement is always larger than the obtainable gain using incoherent measurements. For PMDs of 20, 30 and 40 ps, the ratio $I_{coh.}/I_{incoh.}$ is 7.08, 5.69 and 5.23, respectively. For arbitrary large PMD, the ratio tends to 4.82.

A priori one could imagine that the proposed coherent measurement is optimal (from Shannon's information point of view) in some cases, but not in others. However, Acin and colleagues [19] recently proved that it is optimal, whatever the a priori distribution is. This is a rather surprising result obtained in a research on the optimal estimation of 2-qubit entanglement.

V. CONCLUSION

Thanks to recent conceptual and technological progress, quantum physics starts to reveal its tremendous power for information processing. We presented a scheme based on quantum coherent measurements which provides direct information on the degree of polarization of a single mode optical beam. The measurement is feasible using similar nonlinear crystals as used for photon pair creation via parametric downconversion. The case where depolarization is due to polarization mode dispersion has been analyzed in detail, including the information gain compared to incoherent measurements. This example is of great practical relevance for today's fiber optic communication systems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support by the Swiss OFES within the European projects COST 265 and EQUIP (IST-1999-11053) are acknowledged. Help with the figures by Claudio Vinegoni was greatly appreciated.

[1] *Introduction to Quantum computation and information*, eds H.K. Lo, S. Popescu & T.P. Spiller, (World Scientific, 1998)

[2] *The Physics of Quantum information*, Eds D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert and A. Zeilinger, Springer-Verlag 2000.

[3] S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1259, 1995.

[4] Overlap between the guessed state and the real one.

[5] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 432-435, 1999.

[6] F. Bruyère and O. Audouin, IEEE Photon. Tech. Lett. **6**, 443, 1994; M. Karlsson, Optics Lett. **23**, 688, 1998.

[7] R. Noé et al. IEEE J. Lightwave Tech. **17**, 1602, 1999. C. Francia et al., Electron. Lett. **35**, 414, 1999. M.W. Chat et al., Proceedings of the Conference on Optical Fiber Communication OFC'99, Postdeadline paper 12.1, 1999.

[8] C.D. Poole and R.E. Wagner, "Phenomenological approach to polarization dispersion in long single-mode fibers", Electron. Letts. 22, pp.1029-1030, 1986.

[9] F. Curti, B. Daino, G. de Marchis and F. Matera, IEEE J. Lightwave Tech. **8**, 1162, 1990.

[10] N. Gisin and JP. Pellaux, "Polarization mode dispersion: time versus frequency domains", Opt. Commun. 89, pp.316-323, 1992.

[11] N. Gisin and the COST 241 Group, *Definition of polarization mode dispersion and first results of the COST 241 round-robin measurements*, Pure and Applied Optics, **4**, 511-522, 1995.

[12] H.K. Tsang and R. Bhat, *Electron. Lett.* **31**, 1773, 1995.

[13] D.T. Reid et al., *Applied Optics* **37**, 8142, 1998.

[14] M.O.Scully, B.-G. Englert and Ch.J. Bednar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4433, 1999.

[15] A. Tomita, "Complete Bell state measurement with controlled photon absorption and quantum interference", quant-ph/0006093.

[16] P. Kwiat et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4337, 1995.

[17] P. Kwiat, E. Waks, A.G. White, I. Appelbaum and Ph. Eberhard, Phys. Rev. **60A**, 773, 1999.

[18] That is, the two photons propagate in different directions, or they propagate at different times (i.e. one behind the other).

[19] A. Acin, R. Tarrach and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 62307, 2000.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. Fig. 1 Principle of depolarization due to PMD. The incoming pulse (left of the fiber) is decomposed onto the fast and slow principal polarization states (right of the fiber, see text).
2. Fig. 2 Probability distribution for the DOP in case of Gaussian pulses with a spread of 10 ps and optical fibers with PMDs of 20 ps (full line), 30 ps (dahsed) and 40 ps(dotted line).
3. Fig. 3 A possible collinear configuration using two nonlinear crystal in series.